UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2904
11 January 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 11 January 1990, at 5.20 p.m.

President:	Mr. ESSY	(Côte d'Ivoire)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Cuba	Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA
	Democratic Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TORNUDD
	France	Mr. DE LA SABLIERE
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. VOICU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Crispin TICKELL
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

89-60236/A 6437V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 5.25 p.m.

OPENING STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): At the beginning of 1990, o the threshold of the last decade of the twentieth century, I should like to extend my best wishes to all the members of the Council and other representatives and to the Secretary-General and his staff. Côte d'Ivoire began its term of office as a member of the Security Council on 1 January 1990. At the same time it assumed the presidency of this important organ of the United Nations. In shouldering this great responsibility, Côte d'Ivoire is mindful of the need to respect the ideals o the Charter of the United Nations.

EXPRESSION OF WELCOME TO THE NEW MEMBERS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND OF THANKS TO THE OUTGOING MEMBERS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In presiding over this firs meeting of the Security Council in 1990, I am happy to welcome the other new members of the Council, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Romania and Zaire. The Council is fortunate to be able to draw upon the knowledge and experience of their representatives.

I also take this opportunity to pay tribute to the outgoing members of the Council - Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia. On behalf of the Counci I express heartfelt gratitude to them for their valuable contributions to the work of the Council over the past two years. The representatives of those States have spared no effort to find positive solutions to the complex problems before the Council, in a spirit of understanding and sincere collaboration. I express our deep appreciation to the delegations of those States, and especially to their Permanent Representatives to the United Nations, Their Excellencies Ambassadors Hocine Djoudi, Paulo Nogueira-Batista, Jai Pratap Rana, Absa Claude Diallo and Dragoslav Pejic. I wish them every success in their future activities, and I hope that the Council will be able to call on them when necessar

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should also like to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Dr. Enrique Peñalosa, Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations, for the competence he displayed as President of the Security Council for the month of December 1989. I take pleasure in mentioning here his great generosity in providing his successor with all the logistical support necessary to ensure the success of our deliberations. On behalf of the members of the Council, I express our gratitude to Ambassador Peñalosa.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION RELATING TO AFGHANISTAN

LETTER DATED 9 JANUARY 1990 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21071)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them a letter dated 9 January 1990 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, contained in document S/21071.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/21073, which contains the text of the draft resolution that has been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

(The President)

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/20465, which contains the text of a note by the Secretary-General dated 15 February 1989, and to document S/20911, which contains the text of a report of the Secretary-General dated 20 October 1989.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: None

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the voting is as follows: 15 votes in favour, none against. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 647 (1990).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

READEX FICHE

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2905
17 January 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 17 January 1990, at 11 a.m.

President:	Mr. ESSY	(Côte d'Ivoire)
Members:	Canada	Mr. KIRSCH
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Cuba	Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA
	Democratic Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. DE LA SABLIERE
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. VOICU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Crispin TICKELL
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60243/A 6450V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 3 JANUARY 1990 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES AD INTERIM OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF NICARAGUA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21066)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Nicaragua in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Serrano Caldera (Nicaragua) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in response to the request contained in a letter dated 3 January 1990 from the Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/21066.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/21084, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Malaysia and Zaire.

The first speaker is the representative of Nicaragua, on whom I now call.

Mr. SERRANO CALDERA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): Permit me, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month, and to wish you every success in carrying out your delicate tasks.

I wish also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Colombia, Mr. Enrique Peñalosa, who presided over the Council in December 1989, a month characterized by intense and delicate political and diplomatic activity.

Nicaragua has requested the Security Council to meet in order to denounce before the Council the Government of the United States for its forced entry into the residence of our Ambassador to Panama and for a series of actions violating the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations in particular and international law in general.

Our request was intended also to obtain a Security Council resolution guaranteeing diplomatic privileges and immunities and respect for the integrity of diplomatic missions.

With the President's permission, I wish to yield to the Ambassador of Nicaragua to Panama, Mr. Antenor Ferrey, so that the Council can hear direct testimony on the attack on and forced entry into our diplomatic mission in Panama by United States interventionist forces. I shall conclude my statement following Ambassador Ferrey's statement.

Mr. FERREY (interpretation from Spanish): I have come before the Security Council to testify to serious attacks against Nicaragua's diplomatic mission in the sister republic of Panama. I myself was a target, when my country's diplomatic residence was attacked by invading United States troops in Panama.

The facts are these: On 29 December 1989, at approximately 5.30 p.m. Panama time, I received a telephone call from my residence, in which my brother - Nicaraguan army Lieutenant-Colonel Alvaro Ferrey, in transit through Panama -

(Mr. Ferrey)

informed me that United States troops had surrounded the residence and threatened its occupants, demanding over loudspeakers that they leave the premises within two minutes with their hands up.

I told my brother to remain inside, await my arrival, and inform the United States troops that the premises were the residence of the Nicaraguan Ambassador and were inviolable under international law, and that the occupants would not leave the residence. To Nicaraguan officials who informed them that the premises were the residence of the Nicaraguan Ambassador, United States troops replied by firing into the air, firing three volleys near the residence.

Just afterwards, at 5.35 p.m., I went from the Embassy to the residence, arriving there some 12 minutes later, at approximately 5.47 p.m. As I approached the residence I could see the ring of invading troops that surrounded it. United States soldiers had deployed four M-113 armed transport vehicles and Hummer artillery vehicles. Three combat helicopters and a C-130 communications aircraft were flying over the besieged residence.

When I arrived in front of the residence, I began a discussion with the United States colonel commanding the troops. I identified myself, showing him the diplomatic credentials issued by the Panamanian Foreign Ministry to accredited diplomats in that country, as well as my passport. I told him his actions - an attempt to enter the Ambassador's residence by force - constituted a reprehensible outrage that violated international law and the Vienna Conventions, and that there was no excuse for the troops to enter the building.

(Mr. Ferrey)

The discussion with the United States officer went on for an hour and 20 minutes, and it is well known that during that time the high command of the invading troops had every certainty and knowledge that it was acting against the residence of the Nicaraguan Ambassador.

The leader of the United States troops continually threatened to enter the residence, giving me an ultimatum that my comrades inside the house should leave with their hands up. I replied that we were not at war with the United States troops and that we were not prepared to make any gesture of surrender, that we were within Nicaraguan jurisdiction and that they could not enter for any reason.

The colonel continued to say that they were going to enter, with my permission or by force. It then became clear that there was more than sufficient time and more than sufficient reasons for the command of the invading troops surrounding the residence to be convinced that it was a diplomatic residence and that therefore they had no right to enter, just as they had no right to occupy Panamanian territory.

At one point it seemed that the translator was telling me that the military operation was to be called off and that only a few observation patrols would remain to ensure, supposedly, the security of the residence. However, five minutes later - around 1910 hours - the United States colonel came to me again and told me that he had determined with his command that this was not the residence of the Nicaraguan Ambassador and the troops were going to enter. Thinking about what the translator had told me earlier and the new reaction and decision of the United States colonel, I was clear in my own mind that they were entirely sure that it was the residence of the Nicaraguan Ambassador and that the main objective was to enter by force and remove those inside. It was clear to me then that this huge military operation was an act of provocation to unleash an escalation of violence against Nicaragua.

(Mr. Ferrey)

In the circumstances I considered it more prudent, in order to avoid a blood bath, to negotiate with the United States colonel for the peaceful exit of my family and the Nicaraguan officials who were inside so that they could be seen, but I reiterated that at no time could the invading troops enter or penetrate the residence. When my family came out, I managed to break through those surrounding me and to get past a squad preventing my entry into the house, and was able to get through the fence to enter the garage area of the residence.

At that precise moment - 1915 hours - the United States soldiers entered an area which is part of the residence itself. I asked them not to enter the house and to leave the premises. Despite my requests, just a few seconds later a larger number of soldiers started to go into the residence, threatening us with their guns, and I therefore went to the steps in an attempt to prevent the United States troops from gaining access to the residence that way.

When the soldiers tried to enter, I shouted at them to get out of that territory, which was under Nicaraguan jurisdiction and which they could not enter. They continued advancing and ran right into me. The officer leading the group threw himself upon me and fought with me hand to hand and we both fell down the steps towards the garage. At that time all the Nicaraguan officials who were in the residence began to fight with the United States troops. They were punched and overcome by the vast superiority in numbers and weapons of the invading troops.

Despite our resistance and the continued signs of attacks, it was not possible to prevent the entry of at least 30 United States soldiers into the residence. That occurred at approximately 1925 hours on 29 December. Once I could free myself from the officer with whom I was struggling I entered my residence, where I continued to demand that they leave the premises, which were protected by international law. However, that was entirely futile.

(Mr. Ferrey)

After the forced entry, the United States troops searched the whole residence and began to sack it. They took more than $5,000, purses, suitcases containing clothing, household appliances, shoes and even cosmetics and perfume. They took everything that they could lay their hands on. Whatever they could not carry was destroyed. I strongly protested about all these actions. The response of the troops was to strike the women who remained in the residence. The assault perpetrated by the United States troops lasted approximately an hour and a half - until 2055 hours on 29 December.

After the attack the soldiers left, carrying off various kinds of property and money and other objects from the residence. Nothing has yet been recovered. However, the United States troops did not leave the residence premises until 2120 hours. Here I must say that although the material damage was great, much more serious was the moral damage suffered by Nicaragua and by the legal institutions governing diplomatic relations.

It was an unspeakable attack on law, morality, the most fundamental norms of civilized relations between States and respect for the inviolability of diplomacy and missions. It must be strongly condemned. Otherwise diplomacy will become a risky career, in which we shall be treated like hostages and cannon fodder by those who understand only the use of force and violence.

We must similarly denounce another attack suffered by the Nicaraguan diplomatic mission in Panama. On 31 December, at 0935 hours, United States soldiers broke into the apartment of two Nicaraguan diplomatic officials on the first floor of the Regina Building in the Bella Vista area of Panama City. The United States troops demanded to enter the apartment, which was the residence of the Nicaraguan diplomats, Omar Pineda and Maria Teresa Lopez, and of the

(Mr. Ferrey)

Ambassador's Secretary, Marbella Mayorga. There was no one in the apartment at the time. The owner was forced to open up the apartment by the soldiers, who had threatened to break in if he refused to help them. The soldiers entered the apartment and searched it completely, using the opportunity, as had occurred earlier at my residence, to take away certain belongings, including an envelope containing dollars, which were the savings of a domestic employee of the Embassy.

That last action by the United States occupation troops demonstrates that the very serious incident at the Ambassador's residence on 29 December was in no way an accident, as the United States Government had declared, but was part of a specific plan of provocation against Nicaragua aimed at creating greater tension in relations between the two countries in order to justify a warlike escalation against the Nicaraguan people.

Mr. SERRANO CALDERA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish) (continued): Once again Nicaragua has been obliged to call for a meeting of the Security Council and to appear before it in order to denounce another violation by the United States Government of the rules governing relations between States and the basis of international coexistence.

This time the violation is of the Vienna Convention of 18 April 1961, which codifies the obligation of States fully to respect the privileges and immunities by international law of diplomatic missions and agents, especially with regard to the inviolablity of the premises and residences of diplomatic missions and the immunity, safety and personal integrity of diplomatic agents. It is a violation of the Havana Convention of 1928, which provides that:

"Diplomatic officers shall be inviolate as to their persons, their residence, private or official, and their property".

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

It is a violation of the New York Convention (resolution 3166 (XXVIII)) of 14 December 1973, which provides for the prevention and punishment of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents.

Once again the United States Government has disregarded and failed to respect the Judgment of the International Court of Justice of 27 June 1986, which recognized that the United States attacked Nicaragua in violation of international customary law and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. In addition it stated:

"... the United States of America is under a duty immediately to cease and to refrain from all such acts as may constitute breaches of [its] legal obligations". (S/18221, annex, p. 140)

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

As everyone knows, on 29 December 1989 - the year that has just ended - the forces that invaded the Republic of Panama carried out a new attack on the most fundamental rules and practices governing diplomatic immunity and the integrity and inviolability of diplomatic headquarters by using force to enter the residence of the Ambassador of Nicaragua. The hour and 20 minutes of brave opposition by our Ambassador to that country made absolutely no difference to the aggressors, nor did the explanation - repeated over and over again - of this obvious fact: that the forces of occupation were in front of the residence of the Ambassador and that, therefore, in no circumstances were they permitted to attack that residence and violate the territorial and legal integrity of a free, sovereign country. Nor did it make any difference that women and children were in the residence and could have been sacrificed to the violence and the irrational behaviour of the aggressors.

While the violation of the residence of the Ambassador of Nicaragua to Panama was the most serious in the chain of attacks by the forces of occupation, we cannot overlook - and the Security Council is aware of this - other instances demonstrating a lack of respect and other instances of aggression: diplomats captured; diplomatic headquarters ignominiously surrounded with barbed wire, tanks, guns; soldiers crawling on the ground in hostile, warlike positions and shouting; deafening noise from loudspeakers going at full blast - a clear insult not only to good taste and common decency but also to tranquillity and the minimum respect that should be observed for the dignity of human beings.

It is true that some kind of explanation has been given for what happened, but at this point it is very difficult for us to believe in explanations and promises. When our Embassy in Panama was surrounded by the United States invading forces, upon my Government's instructions I met with the Secretary-General of the United Nations to inform him of what had happened and to ensure that, through him,

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

with his lofty world position, as well as through bilateral diplomatic channels, the Government of the United States would be informed of our concern about and reaction to the dangerous and provocative step that had been taken.

On that occasion the United States Government said - this was communicated to me - that the step had been taken only to avoid any possibility of particular persons seeking asylum in our diplomatic headquarters, but that it in no way constituted a threat to the integrity and diplomatic immunity of our residence.

After the assault on the residence of our Ambassador to Panama had taken place, we were told that it had been a mistake, and certain explanations were given. On the day following those explanations, the residences of other diplomatic officials of our Mission to Panama were violated, and, indeed, further violations of diplomatic immunity have occurred since that date.

Given those facts, can we accept explanations and believe in promises? I think it is very difficult to have any illusions when we are confronted by the brutal refutation constituted by the actual facts.

Accordingly, we demand that an investigation be carried out and that the appropriate penalties be imposed on those responsible for the attacks. To that end, we are having recourse to the legal and diplomatic means that international law and the United Nations system make available to all peoples of the world. Thus we have again come to the Security Council, in the hope that it will proceed in a fashion appropriate to the gravity of the event.

In our statement to the Security Council in connection with the invasion of Panama, we pointed out that when the rules underlying international relations were not respected, all that was left was the concept that might makes right - the law of the jungle.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

Today we turn to the Security Council once again because the diplomatic headquarters of our country have been violated and because violations of the essential rules of human coexistence continue.

But we have also come to the Security Council because it is difficult not to view this action as a provocation designed to obtain an equivalent response - which would result in the unleashing of even broader actions against Nicaragua, with a serious threat to international peace and security.

Can such a thing be accepted? Can the international community remain passive when aggression is carried out with impunity and when the principles of civilized coexistence are eroded? Can the Security Council remain silent in regard to such an attack on a country and on the entire system of international relations? Can the United Nations carry out its lofty mission when unbridled violence seems to be the United States Government's rule of behaviour?

How can the United States Government reconcile these deep contradictions? How can it, on the one hand, adhere to international treaties and, on the other, violate them in a scandalous way? How can it approve of and adhere to a draft resolution - of which it was a sponsor and which later was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly - declaring the next decade to be the decade of international law, at a time when it proceeds to invade countries and violate embassies?

We believe that all this is very serious and requires not only concern but also effective action by international bodies on the basis of legal authority and the juridical instruments available to them precisely in order to deal with such situations and avoid the deterioration of the system.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

The undeniable gravity of those facts cannot alter the fundamental facts of the invasion and the maintenance of the occupation troops on Panamanian soil. We therefore believe it essential to speak out vigorously once again against that situation and to demand once again the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces.

On 21 December 1989 the Security Council considered a draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned members of the Council. It was rejected, notwithstanding 10 votes in favour, owing to the veto of the United States and two other permanent members.

On 22 December 1989 the Organization of American States (OAS) adopted a resolution that, inter alia, called for the withdrawal of United States troops from Panama.

On 29 December 1989 the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 44/240, which demanded the cessation of the intervention and the withdrawal of the occupying forces from Panama.

While that was occurring at the United Nations and in the OAS, the majority of the countries of the world were criticizing the invasion as an act in violation of international law. However, and notwithstanding the resolutions of the United Nations and the OAS, the occupying troops have remained on Panamanian soil and have generated serious incidents, such as the one that brings us to the Security Council today. Thus, so long as the occupying troops remain, the latent threat of further acts of aggression will persist, with all the serious consequences that this implies.

Nicaragua has come before the Security Council because it is convinced that every means available under the United Nations system should be used, for we know that the cause we defend here is an important one because, while being our cause, it is also the universal cause of law, justice and respect in international relations.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

Nicaragua has turned, and will always turn, to the United Nations because we know that the essence of civilization lies in the observance of such procedures and the principles they safeguard, for we believe in law and not in force; we believe in and will continue to defend the equality of States before the law. We have always acted thus and in support of international law. Because we believe in international law we worked tirelessly, with faith and enthusiasm, to have the General Assembly declare, as it did, this last decade of the century the Decade of International Law. Our efforts included the submission of the draft proposal by our foreign minister at the Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Nicosia in 1988 and its presentation by the President of the Republic himself to the Heads of State of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries meeting at Belgrade in 1989, and the work done at New York in the non-aligned Co-ordinating Bureau and the group on the peaceful settlement of disputes. As I say, those efforts culminated in the unanimous decision taken by the General Assembly last November.

Because we believe in international law and in the United Nations system we had recourse to the International Court of Justice, which, in its historic ruling of 27 June 1986, recognized the acts of aggression by the United States Government against my country.

Because we believe in international law and in the United Nations system we recently came to the Security Council and the General Assembly to denounce and request condemnation of the invasion of the Republic of Panama by United States troops.

Because we believe in international law and in the United Nations system, we are here today before the Council to denounce the attack on our diplomatic mission and the violations of the Vienna Convention.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

Nicaragua will never tire of following such procedures or of using this forum, for we know that words are spoken here not only in our defence but in defence of all peoples and countries, small countries in particular, and in defence of the principles of international coexistence. We know that, through recourse to legal, political and diplomatic means, a firm, vigorous and unswerving response must be given in these forums.

We do not want to answer force with force, violence with violence; we want to believe that there is always a civilized way of dealing with conflicts and disagreements; we want to abolish war and establish peace; we want to live in harmony with all peoples of the world, without exception; we want respect and justice to prevail in international relations.

Whenever Nicaragua speaks out against a violation against any one it is doing so as an act of faith in the political and diplomatic option. But it is doing so also as an act of hope for good sense and good judgement.

The invasion by United States troops of the Republic of Panama and all the ensuing violations of the Vienna Convention and international law are in stark contrast to the new scenario in international relations; they are a violent break with the new context of world politics, which has been described with such hope as the end of the cold war. However, we see that while on the one hand there is talk of a new era of détente, on the other hand the United States is arrogantly resorting to the use of force and violence.

For all those reasons, and in the face of what has occurred and is still occurring, the international community has the right and the duty to require of the United States conduct consistent with law and the system of international relations. The United States, in turn, has the obligation to act in accordance

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

with its serious responsibilities as a world Power and a permanent member of the Security Council.

A country's world power does not give it licence to commit all kinds of abuses and violations; it is an obligation, not a privilege; it is a duty, not a right. It requires exemplary conduct; it is not a prerogative, nor does it bestow impunity.

World power requires political and moral coherence; arbitrary or ambiguous actions cannot be justified. It is unacceptable that the United States should behave in a contradictory and arbitrary manner, acting in accordance with law and the system of international relations when it feels like it and rejecting them when it does not.

In 1979, when the United States suffered the invasion of its diplomatic mission in Teheran, the then Secretary of State, Mr. Cyrus Vance, stated in the Security Council that

> "Let us move together, in a manner that is clear and convincing, to demonstrate that the rule of law has meaning and that our machinery of peace has practical relevance." (2182nd meeting, para. 28)

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

I believe it appropriate to recall those words here and to invoke them as valid on this occasion, in the name of that political and legal responsibility and that ethical coherence to which I referred a moment ago.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Nicaragua for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): I would like to extend my warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, and my thanks and best wishes to your illustrious predecessor for the way in which he conducted the business of the Council. I would like as well to welcome here officially the new members of the Council.

At the outset of this debate, I want to pause and ask a serious question. During the Second World War, because of rationing here in the United States, all of the railroad and bus stations carried large posters with the simple words: "Is this trip necessary"? An appropriate question for the Council right now should be: "Is this trip necessary"? The simply answer, of course, is: "No". Nor is this action appropriate.

Let me begin by telling the Council why.

The issue at hand is an allegation of an action not consistent with diplomatic privileges and immunities that has been fully acknowledged and fully dealt with. There is no threat to international peace and security that would require a formal Council meeting or even Council consideration of this issue. The incident is not a potential threat to peace and security. Clear remedies for dealing with it already exist.

In normal diplomatic practice, if an issue such as this cannot be resolved directly between those concerned, then the dean of the local diplomatic corps - in this case, the Papal Nuncio - mediates the incident. Why this unusual practice of calling the Council into session has been insisted upon, and why the regular norms

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

of diplomatic procedure have been discarded, should be transparently clear to all from what we have just heard from the Nicaraguan representative. This is an effort to turn the Council into a propaganda exercise - nothing more and nothing less.

That incident is, for all intents and purposes, now fully behind us. As I have told the members of the Council in informal session, the United States has no intention of deliberately entering a diplomatic residence, much less one which it is claimed was occupied by the Ambassador of Nicaragua to Panama. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations clearly sets forth the inviolability of diplomatic premises. The United States fully supports and abides by that Convention. The regret of the United States for this incident has been clearly and completely expressed in a formal note to the Government of Nicaragua. In addition, the highest levels of the United States Government, including the President of the United States, expressed in public regret and the continuing commitment of the United States fully to abide by the Vienna Convention.

Let me now for a moment comment on the context in which this unfortunate situation occurred. And then let me discuss a number of the mitigating circumstances and facts.

The situation in Panama was indeed extraordinary. A corrupt military dictator established a reign of terror to thwart the will of the Panamanian people and to subvert its constitutional order; and not confident of his ability to preserve his illegal hold on power, he sought to create a large, separate private army to do so. That private army, in fact, was made up of groups of marauding bands - the so-called Dignity Battalions. Abuse became the order of the day as private bands operated both within and outside of the national forces of Panama and both in and outside the national capital. You all saw the dignity that those battalions brought to the people of Panama yourselves in the television shots of the bloody

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

public beating administered to one of the successful vice-presidential candidates, Mr. Guillermo Ford.

In order to support those and other similar activities, the dictatorship created a financial backbone built on drug trafficking and arms dealing. Human rights, democracy and the rule of law were trampled upon in order to satisfy the desires of one man.

As the Council well knows, last May the voters of Panama cast their preference for the candidates of the democratic opposition. This has been fully certified and ratified by the Electoral Commission of Panama; it has been attested to by the Roman Catholic Church, which was given responsibility for safeguarding the actual election results; and it has been verified and attested to by a wide group of international observers. Even the Noriega régime's candidates for President and Vice-President publicly recognized the Endara Government and called on their followers to do the same. Indeed, no one that we know of, except perhaps the dictator himself, has ever seriously contested the results of that election.

After months of arduous negotiations, including four ministerial-level meetings of hemispheric leaders, attempts to pave the way for a peaceful transition to a democratic Government in Panama failed. Hemispheric leaders and the Organization of American States (OAS) set 1 September as the deadline for the transfer of power by democratic means as called for in the Panamanian constitution. But they were unsuccessful: Noriega ignored the deadlines and flouted the decisions of the OAS, which included a resolution condemning and delegitimizing the régime and a devastating human rights report. The dictator of Panama continued to rule through the use of force, repression and terror.

During that period, Noriega and his private armed bands were responsible for hundreds of incidents of harassment against the United States, its personnel, their

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

families and others, all of whom were stationed in Panama to carry out the obligations of the United States under the terms of the Panama Canal Treaties - the Torrijos-Carter agreements. During the last month of 1989, Noriega suddenly declared Panama to be in a state of war with the United States. Two days after his hand-picked National Assembly declared war, Panamanian soldiers killed an unarmed American soldier and beat and harassed a military officer and his wife. Evidence pointed to other actions being planned against United States personnel.

The rapid deterioration of the situation threatened the lives of additional United States civilian and military personnel lawfully stationed in Panama under the authority of the Treaties. The action threatened the safe and effective operation of the Canal in conformity with those same Treaties. The situation was fast becoming unsustainable. President Bush acted in self-defense and in defense of our rights and obligations under the Canal Treaties, with the approval of the legitimate Government of Panama.

The Embassy of the United States in Panama was then fired upon by Noriega's private armed bands. Several United States Embassy residences were broken into by those same groups. Over a period of days, snipers attacked both Panamanian civilians and the United States military.

Today, the new Panamanian police forces are rapidly reassuming their functions, engaging in joint patrols and dealing with the question of law and order. However, in the first days after the military action by the United States, there were incidents of looting and lawlessness in a situation where there was literally no one able to exercise police responsibility, even on a temporary basis.

During that period, the people of Panama welcomed their own liberation from Noriega's tyranny. Concerned about renewed sniper and other attacks in their

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

neighbourhoods, many people in Panama reported to competent authorities weapons caches in locations throughout the country. In fact, many of the arms caches were located with the assistance of the members of the former Panama Defense Forces concerned by the threat to Panama created by Noriega's private armed bands. Indeed, so far more than 80,000 weapons have been found and confiscated. Eighty thousand weapons is a large number of weapons; indeed, it is a stupendous quantity to arm a public security force of less than 5,000 men. Sixteen weapons per man is pretty good.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

It was against the backdrop of this situation of a serious threat to law and order, to life and liberty, by armed bands operating contrary to all requirements of law and order and with large caches of weapons hidden all over the city and the country that at approximately 4.30 in the afternoon of 29 December United States forces in Panama received a report from a previously very reliable source that there was a weapons cache stored at a house in Calle B, A-15, in the Dos Mares area of Panama City. The report, which indicated that in the previous 24 hours there had been a flurry of activity, with automobile vans moving in and out of the neighbourhood on three previous nights, triggered the search. Military units of the United States proceeded to the address to investigate the report. When they found the house, the United States troops announced three times over a loudspeaker their intention to conduct a search, and, seeing no reaction, they then fired two shots into the air. During the time in which they were announcing their intentions and requesting the occupants to come out of the house, no one exited. However, a man did drive up. He identified himself first as consul, then as ambassador, but the identification he produced to identify himself was apparently not official diplomatic documentation. Subsequently he claimed that the house was his own residence.

The United States soldiers made diligent efforts to confirm independently the address of the Nicaraguan Ambassador. They did so by checking the official diplomatic list issued by the Government of Panama during the Noriega period. These records indicated that the Nicaraguan Ambassador lived in an apartment in the Punta Paitilla area of Panama City. Subsequently the Panamanian Foreign Ministry confirmed that the Punta Paitilla address was the latest address officially listed for the Nicaraguan Ambassador. This is true, even though the Ambassador claims to have occupied the residence in question for six months. And we all know it is the responsibility of the Nicaraguan Embassy in Panama to inform the Panamanian

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Foreign Ministry fully and currently of the properties which it is occupying and which are therefore subject to the application of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

The information prompting the search of the building proved to be accurate. The soldiers found a large weapons cache. Still believing it was a private residence, the soldiers removed from the house the following arsenal of weapons: over 1300 rounds of ammunition; four Uzi sub-machine-guns; six rocket-propelled grenade launchers; one light anti-tank weapon; 12 AK-47 automatic rifles; three grenades; a number of other rifles; a shotgun; and four rocket-propelled-grenade launcher sights - hardly the kinds of weapons that Ambassadors would stockpile at their residences even to protect themselves against criminals or thugs. While the Nicaraguan Ambassador, with his immunity, is certainly not obliged to answer this question, we can all wonder just a little about what the intended purposes of the weapons, rocket-launchers and all, might actually have been.

During the search the United States military unit also discovered a Nicaraguan Government official seal, evidence that the house might in fact belong to the Nicaraguan Embassy. However, the absence of cooking facilities or other domestic furnishings, the mattresses on the floor and the general extreme state of disorder of the house, together with the inconsistent responses from the man who claimed to be Ambassador about his own position at the Embassy, put into serious question the actual role and purpose of the house - and indeed it still does. None the less, once the status of the house as a possible premises of the Nicaraguan Embassy was clearly verified, the soldiers immediately returned the arms to the building and left the area. No one in the house was arrested or detained, nor was the residence itself damaged in any way.

On the very same night of the incident, the United States Government formally expressed its regret to the Government of Nicaragua through diplomatic channels.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

The Security Council was informed of the text of that note and of our follow-up to the incident in documents which were circulated to the members of the Council. President Bush has also publicly stated that the United States regretted the incident. We also assured the Government of Nicaragua through diplomatic channels that the United States did not then have, and does not now have, any intention of interfering with normal diplomatic activities.

Nicaragua's response to our note of regret over the incident was to expel 20 American diplomats in Managua, something the Government of Nicaragua has wanted to do for several months.

The 29 December incident was fully reported by the United States military, acknowledged and regretted. We note in passing that the incident of 31 December claimed by the Government of Nicaragua was not reported to the United States military forces in the region. Details of that incident remain murky. We do know that the Government of Nicaragua chose to make its complaint to the American Embassy in Managua only on 2 January. We do not know why this was the first and only notification to the United States Government. We do know their chosen approach delayed the Embassy's investigation in Panama City. We do know the alleged "diplomatic" apartment has since been vacated. Our investigation continues.

Following its full investigation of the incident of 29 December, the causes for the incident and its effect, the United States Government immediately reviewed its instructions to its personnel in Panama. On 31 December new, detailed instructions were issued to United States military forces and civilian personnel in Panama. These instructions were designed to ensure that Embassy premises, accredited diplomats and their private residences are accorded the diplomatic privileges and immunities to which they are entitled under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The instructions explicitly quote the pertinent articles of the Vienna Convention, which the United States not only fully accepts but supports.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Subsequently the Council of the Organization of American States reviewed the issue and pronounced itself on the question. If the object of Nicaraguan activity was to obtain international involvement, one would have thought that the action by the Organization of American States would have certainly done the trick.

Given all these facts, which we have explained directly to the Government of Nicaragua - and for the most part already publicly - we question why Nicaragua chose to call this meeting of the Council. The incident in Panama was regrettable, and my Government acted immediately to ensure that the inviolability of the premises continued to be respected. Nicaragua responded by expelling 20 United States diplomats in Managua and by calling for this meeting of the Council. The decision to expel most of our diplomats in Managua is certainly not compatible with the improved relations that the Nicaraguan Government has told us repeatedly it would like to achieve with the United States. The Government of Nicaragua's response is greatly out of proportion to what occurred and appears to be motivated by a desire solely to inflate the issue for propaganda purposes.

To illustrate this last point it might be useful and instructive to put this incident in perspective by reviewing some pertinent history. Nicaragua, as history will show, has itself been highly selective in its adherence to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities and to regional norms. I would like here to cite only a few examples of the deliberate violations of the Vienna Convention in circumstances in which the Government of Nicaragua clearly knew the diplomatic status of the premises and still persisted none the less to invade the premises and to attack individuals covered by the immunity of the premises.

The first incident violated the premises itself. It took place on Christmas

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Eve of 1984. Nicaraguan security forces entered the grounds of the Costa Rican Embassy in Managua. They were seeking a Nicaraguan citizen, José Manuel Urbina Lara, who had been granted asylum by the Government of Costa Rica four months earlier.

After tricking Mr. Urbina Lara into opening the front door of the building, a Nicaraguan soldier forced him at gunpoint to leave the Embassy. In the street, Urbina Lara escaped from his captors and fled back towards the Costa Rican Embassy. The Nicaraguan security guards shot at him, wounding him in the leg and in the shoulder. Fighting off the guard, Urbina Lara managed to re-enter the front yard of the Embassy and struggled for freedom until he had reached the front door of the building. There, while on Costa Rican diplomatic property, he was subdued and dragged away by Nicaraguan authorities, leaving a trail of blood flowing from his wounds on the ground as evidence of his struggle.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Exactly how did the Nicaraguan Government respond to the immediate and vigorous protest of the Costa Rican Government? First of all, it publicly denied that its forces had violated the premises of the diplomatic mission - despite the bloodstains and the bullet hole in the door of the building, more than 20 feet from the front gate. These facts were attested to by the Costa Rican Government. Then the Nicaraguan Government paraded Urbina Lara before the television cameras and declared that the incident was closed. They refused to allow the Costa Rican Ambassador to meet with Urbina Lara, and rejected the Costa Rican suggestion that the Organization of American States (OAS) determine the facts of the situation. In view of the gravity of the situation, the Contadora Group offered its good offices to the two Governments. The Council of the OAS expressed its profound concern over the circumstances, welcomed the offer of the Contadora Group and urged the two countries to accept the offer to facilitate a settlement.

A second instance involved a wilful violation of human rights. In 1987 a member of the Nicaraguan police force deliberately shot three times through the main gate of the United States Embassy at Managua, wounding an unarmed Nicaraguan citizen. The United States formally protested this illegal action to the Nicaraguan Government.

A third incident involves a violation in the usage of premises. Article 41 of the Vienna Convention requires that all persons enjoying privileges and immunities act with "respect for the laws and regulations of the receiving State". The article also states:

> "The premises of the mission must not be used in any manner incompatible with the functions of the mission as laid down in the present Convention or by other rules of general international law".

In the incident now before us, the numbers and kinds of weapons found in the diplomatic residence which is claimed to be that of the Nicaraguan Ambassador

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

clearly were not intended for the protection of the mission. The arms found in the Nicaraguan Ambassador's residence are the types of weapons used by the so-called Dignity Battalions in Panama and by anti-governmental forces elsewhere in the hemisphere. The presence of such an arms cache is clearly inconsistent with the diplomatic functions protected by the Vienna Convention and clearly violates article 41 of that Convention.

The Nicaraguan Government apparently considers that its immunity applies to sending arms whenever it wants, wherever it wants, however it wants and in whatever quantity it wants. When we met here just a few short weeks ago, the representative of El Salvador showed this Council a surface-to-air missile taken from a Nicaraguan airplane that crashed in El Salvador while on a mission to deliver arms to the FMLN guerrillas.

The United States has continually given the Government of Panama and the diplomatic community in Panama, as well as the Government of Nicaragua, assurances concerning our adherence to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. I am pleased to inform the Council as well that the United States is committed to an early withdrawal of the troops deployed to Panama on 20 December and since.

The United States is prepared once again to give all the Governments of the United Nations assurances that it will continue to comply with its international and hemispheric commitments and with the Central American peace accords and that it is not supplying and will not supply arms to guerrilla and paramilitary forces in neighbouring countries. The key question is whether the Government of Nicaragua is prepared to give a similar assurance about observing the Central American peace accords and not supplying arms to insurgent and paramilitary forces in neighbouring countries.

It is no wonder that the Nicaraguan Government is trying to use aspects of the situation in Panama to distract attention from its own problems with its own people.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

The violence and intimidation have increased in Nicaragua since that Government ended unilaterally the cease-fire with the Nicaraguan resistance on 1 November last year. As the Nicaraguan election approaches, the Sandinistas seem to have sought almost any reason or excuse to crack down on the legitimate political opposition. Its use of harassment and intimidation and its delay in permitting the opposition to receive funding guaranteed by Nicaraguan law are all attempts to strangle the democratic process.

The inviolability of diplomatic residences is a matter of real concern to all of us. But an honest mistake as to the identity of a particular site as diplomatic property, where no harm is done to either the persons or the property of a diplomatic mission and where an apology has been immediately forthcoming, is hardly a potential threat to the international peace and security of the world at large.

Meanwhile Central America longs for peace, national reconciliation, democracy, freedom, respect for economic and political rights and economic progress. The chance is that through free elections Nicaragua will open its society to the peaceful changes that will end the violence and make the dream of people a reality for us all. I sincerely hope that the Nicaraguan Government will give its full attention in the weeks ahead to the fundamental task of conducting truly free and fair elections.

Scrupulous compliance by Nicaragua with its commitments under the Esquipulas peace process offers the best hope for peace in Central America and for improved relations between the United States and Nicaragua. Further diversions from this effort only waste the time and the opportunity now before Nicaragua to become once again a truly democratic participant in the family of nations. That should not be either an outrageous or an impossible dream.

The actions that the United States took in regard to the premises of the Nicaraguan Embassy in Panama are regrettable. However, they did not pose and do not

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

now pose any threat to international peace and security. Discussions of this nature in the Council trivialize the work of this important body. There was no valid reason to insist that the Security Council debate this issue in the first place and, consequently, no reason for the Council to adopt a resolution in response to the Nicaraguan complaint.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): My best wishes to you, Mr. President, and our warmest thanks to your distinguished predecessor. My best wishes also go to the new members of the Council - Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Romania and Zaire - and we warmly welcome them into our ranks.

My delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. We do so because of our continuing view that it relates to an incident not appropriate for action by the Security Council. We naturally view with concern any breach of the inviolability of diplomatic premises. But in this case the United States Government has already formally and at the highest level expressed its regret to the Government of Nicaragua.

The Council will recall the terms of Article 52 (2) in Chapter VIII of the Charter, where members are urged to make very effort to achieve pacific settlement of disputes through regional arrangements or by regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council. This is precisely what happened over the present

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

incident. The question it raised was well and truly dealt with in a resolution adopted by the appropriate regional agency - the Organization of American States - on 8 January.

The matter is therefore closed. We see no reason to re-open it in the Security Council. In our view, it causes no threat to international peace and security nor provides any basis for a Security Council resolution under Chapter VI of the Charter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

It is my understanding that the Council is now ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall now put draft resolution S/21084 to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zaire

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the voting is as follows: 13 votes in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has not been adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) (interpretation from French): I take this opportunity to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I wish also to extend a cordial welcome to the Council's new members.

(spoke in English)

In considering the issue before the Council we took into account that the Government of the United States has acknowledged that the forcible entry of its troops into the residence of the Nicaraguan Ambassador in Panama on 29 December 1989 was an error and has expressed its regrets for that action.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

We voted in favour of the draft resolution because it reaffirms certain basic and important principles guiding the conduct of international relations. The action taken in relation to the Nicaraguan Ambassador's residence went against well-recognized principles of international law, particularly as regards the inviolability of diplomatic missions. By adopting the draft resolution the Security Council would have appropriately added its voice to the voices of other international bodies that have addressed this issue.

On 8 January 1990, the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States declared the United States action to be a violation of the diplomatic immunities and privileges recognized under international law and codified in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

We and other Member States have already expressed concern bilaterally to the Government of the United States over the breach of international conventions resulting from the actions of its forces in this incident. We acknowledge the United States explanation of its mistake and hope that the discussion held today will close the matter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words he addressed to me.

Ms. RASI (Finland): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council at the same time as your country, Côte d'Ivoire, joins the Council.

I should like to welcome all the new members of the Council: Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Romania, Zaire and your country.

I should like also to thank Ambassador Peñalosa for the way in which he guided the work of the Security Council in December.

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

Finland voted in favour of the draft resolution because of our respect for the norms of international law. We consider that the events described in the draft resolution constituted a violation of general principles of international law, as enshrined in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in particular. At the same time, we recognized, as did the draft resolution, that the United States itself had regretted the events in question and had taken measures to prevent the occurence of such events in the future.

Although we voted in favour of the draft resolution for the reasons I have described, we cannot but register our concern over the submission of the draft resolution to the Security Council. We continue to have difficulty in accepting that the subject matter of the draft resolution falls within the competence of the Security Council as defined in the Charter of the United Nations. The events described in the draft resolution are not of such a character as to present a threat to international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Finland for the kind words she addressed to me.

There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2906
31 January 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 31 January 1990, at 11 a.m.

President:	Mr. ESSY	(Côte d'Ivoire)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA
	Democratic Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Ethiopia	Mr. GOSHU
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. VOICU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. LOZINSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WILKINSON
	Zaire	Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60297/A 6499V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

EXPRESSION OF WELCOME TO THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CUBA

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like, at the outset of the meeting, to welcome, on behalf of the Council, the new Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada. We look forward to co-operating with him in the work of the Council.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON (S/21102)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon for the period 22 July 1989 to 25 January 1990, which is contained in document S/21102. Members of the Council also have the following documents before them: document S/21074, letter dated 11 January 1990 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/21117, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now. There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 648 (1990).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.